



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/710,927	11/09/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS-2000-0616-US1	5671

7590 06/24/2003
Rudolf O Siegesmund
4627 N Central Expressway
Suite 2000
Dallas, TX 75205-4022

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

54
pp4

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/710,927	DUTTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peng Ke	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the statement "The invention meeting the needs identified above" would be unclear and confusing since the abstract will be on the first page of a patent, and the abstract doesn't properly and completely describe the invention. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:
"CWP" needs to be defined. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4, 7-10, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kosaka et al. (JP 11250054).

As per claim 4, Kosaka teaches a method for aggregating multiple information items on a display screen of a computer connected to the internet comprising the steps of:

invoking a CWP (page 14, paragraph 1);

invoking a first web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

identifying a first information unit on said first web page so that said first web page is divided into said first information unit and a first web page remainder (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

rendering said first web page remainder transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4);

invoking a second web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

identifying a second information unit on said second web page so that said second web page is divided into said second information unit and a second web page remainder (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5); and

rendering said second web page remainder transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 7, Kosaka teaches the method of claim 4 further comprising saving said CWP, said first information unit and said second information unit as a composite web page (COMPWP) (page 14, paragraph 1).

As per claim 8, Kosaka teaches the method of claim 4 further comprising updating said first information unit (page 15, paragraph 5).

As per claim 9, Kosaka teaches the method of claim 4 further comprising updating said second information unit (page 15, paragraph 5).

As per claim 10, Kosaka teaches a programmable apparatus for display and simultaneous update of multiple information units comprising, programmable hardware comprising;

a computer connected to a network (It is inherent for a computer to be connected to a network in order for it to access the web pages over the internet);

a display screen connected to said computer (fig 5);

a program installed on said computer;

wherein responsive to said program, a web page is acquired from said network and displayed in the display screen (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

wherein an information unit is identified on the web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

and

wherein said information unit is moved to a CWP (page 14, paragraph 1).

As per claim 14, Kosaka teaches a computer-implemented process to display and simultaneously update multiple information units comprising:

using a computer, performing the following series of steps:

powering the computer;

Art Unit: 2174

connecting said computer to at least one network (It is inherent for a computer to be connected to a network in order for it to access the web pages over the internet);

acquiring data in a data level (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

displaying said data levels in a display frame in a first web page (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

invoking said first web page (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 5); and

identifying a first information unit on said first web page (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 5).

As per claim 15, Kosaka teaches the computer implemented process of claim 14 further comprising:

using a computer, updating said data level (page 15, paragraph 5).

As per claim 16, Kosaka teaches the computer implemented process of claim 14 further comprising:

using a computer performing the following steps ,

invoking a canvas web page (page 14, paragraph 1);

positioning said first information unit on said canvas (page 14, paragraph 1);

invoking a second web page (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 6);

identifying a second information unit on said second web page (page 14, paragraph 1);

and

positioning said second information unit on said canvas web page (page 14, paragraph 1).

Art Unit: 2174

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosaka et al. (JP 11250054) in view of Straznitskas.

As per claim 1, Kosaka a method for display of one or more information items comprising the steps of:

invoking a first web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5); and

rendering said first web page remainder transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4).

However Kosaka fails to teach the method comprising:

identifying a first information unit by creating a continuous line around a first information item on said web page so that said web page is divided into said first information unit and a first web page remainder.

Straznitskas teaches identifying a first information unit by creating a continuous line around a first information item on a page so that the page is divided into said first information unit and a first page remainder (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily identify the section that he/she regards as important and relevant.

As per claim 2, Kosaka teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

Art Unit: 2174

invoking a second web page (page 12, paragraph 5, fig 6);
rendering said second web page remainder transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4);
and positioning said second information unit relative to said first information unit (page 14, paragraph 1).

However Kosaka fails to teach the method comprising
identifying a second information unit by creating a continuous line around a second information item on said second web page so that said second web page is divided into said second information unit and a second web page remainder;
and merging the two units by dragging.

Straznitskas teaches identifying a second information unit by creating a continuous line around a second information item on said second web page so that said second web page is divided into said second information unit and a second web page remainder, and dragging the identified object (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily identify and paste the section that he/she regards as important and relevant.

As per claim 3, Kosaka teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising dragging said first information unit to a CWP and positioning said first information unit on the CWP (page 14, paragraph 1).

As per claim 5, Kosaka teaches the method of claim 4 further comprising taking said first information unit to said CWP and positioning said first information unit on the CWP (page 14, paragraph 1).

Art Unit: 2174

However Kosaka fails to teach merging the two units by dragging.

Straznitskas teaches dragging the identified object (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily paste the section that he/she regards it as important and relevant.

As per claim 6, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (See rejection above).

As per claim 11, Kosaka teaches the programmable apparatus of claim 10 wherein said information unit is identified information item on said web page so that said web page is divided into said information unit and a remainder (page 11, fig 5); and

said remainder is rendered transparent (page 13, paragraph 2, 3, 4).

Kosaka fails to teach identified information item by creating a continuous line around it.

Straznitskas teaches identifying a information unit by creating a continuous line around a information item (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily identify the section that he/she regards as important and relevant.

As per claim 12, it is of the same scope as claim 11. (see rejection above)

As per claim 13, Kosaka teaches a computer readable memory for display and simultaneous update of multiple information units comprising:

a computer readable storage medium; (It is inherent for the computer system to have a storage medium)

a computer program stored in said storage medium; (page 8, paragraph 3)

Art Unit: 2174

the storage medium, so configured by said computer program, causes the computer ;
to acquire a web page from said network and display said web page in a display screen
(page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);

to identify an information unit on the web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);
to position said information unit on a CWP (page12, paragraph 5, fig 5);
to acquire from said network a second web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig 6);
to identify a second information unit on the second web page (page12, paragraph 5, fig
6);

to cause a first remainder of said first web page to be transparent;
to cause a second remainder of said second web page to be transparent (page 13,
paragraph 2, 3, 4);

However Kosaka fails to teach the method wherein said program is adapted for dragging
of said first information unit and said second information unit by a user, so that responsive to said
dragging, said program positions said first information unit on said CWP and positions said
second information unit on said CWP so that said CWP is visible through said first remainder
and said second remainder and said first information unit is visible through said second
remainder.

Straznitskas teaches dragging the identified object (page 8).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include
Straznitskas' teaching with Kosaka's method in order to allow the user to easily paste the section
that he/she regards as important and relevant.

Conclusion

The following patent is cited to further show the state of the art with respect to a method for keeping aggregated portion of multiple documents:

Deposants (WO 98/55914): discloses a method and system for data qualification in pre-collected documents.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (703) 305-7615. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE L KINCAID can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Peng Ke
June 2, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100